UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,515	04/17/2001	C. Gomer Thomas	2916-0133P	5684

2292	7590	03/22/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
HUYNH, SON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/835,515	THOMAS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Son P. Huynh	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 January 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-20,22-26,35-38 and 44-47* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-20,22-26,35-38 and 44-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 April 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 14-20, 22-26, 35-38, 44-47

have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues in Eldering et al., the actual insertion schedule for insertion of the ads

is not provided by the content provider (advertisers), but is computed within the AMS

100 (page 21, paragraph 2).

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims merely recite "a content

provider (CP) interface to receive, from a content provider unit, ... an insertion

schedule..." Eldering discloses the AMS comprises an advertiser interface, e.g., Web

(browser) interface that allows advertisers to enter parameters, which characterize their

advertisement and are used to form ad characterization vector (col. 5, lines 9-14). The

parameters entered by the advertisers comprises advertisement duration, minimum

advertisement bandwidth, household income, and other advertisement specific

parameters (e.g., broadcast time of the advertisement) – see col. 2, lines 30-39, col. 5,

lines 30-46, col. 6, lines 18-40, col. 8, lines 35-43). The AMS uses ad parameters to

match with the avails in a programming stream, if the ad parameter(s) match(es) with

the avails data, inserting the advertisement into the programs streams by insertion

module 114 (col. 9, lines 4-12). Thus, the ad parameters entered by the advertisers is

interpreted as insertion schedule because the insertion module inserts the

advertisements as scheduled such as ad bandwidth matches with avail bandwidth, ad

time matches with avail time, ad duration matches with avail duration, etc.

For the reason given above, rejections on claims 1-12, 14-20, 22-26, 35-38, 44-47 are

analyzed as discussed below.

Claims 13, 21, 27-34, 39-43 have been canceled.

Specification

2.   The amendment filed January 5, 2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a)

because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no

amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added

material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

The Ethernet adapter can also be used **by the Insertion Engine 820 of the Liaison**

unit 104 (page 3, paragraph 2, lines 6-7); **The outputs of this operation can be**

stored in an Account Infor storage 812 (page 4, paragraph 2, lines 9-10, page 5,

lines 1-2); **The outputs of this operation can be stored in a Content Storage 816**

(page 5, paragraph 3, lines 7-8).

        Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 recites "The liaison interface" in line 1 should be replaced as – The liaison unit--

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-12, 14-20, 22-26, 35-38, 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Mao et al. (US 6,459,427) in view of Eldering et al. (US

6,820,277).

Regarding claim 1, Mao discloses for use with a broadcast system operable to carry

digital packets to multiple recipients simultaneously (broadcast system 10 provides

digital video, audio and Internet packets to multiple recipients (150) simultaneously –

figures 1-4, col. 5, lines 5-53);

a content liaison unit comprising:

a content provider (CP) interface (i.e., Interface to Internet content

provider such as advertisers, news provider, weather provider, etc. and analog TV

provider and digital TV provider (col. 4, lines 8-50) to receive, from a content provider

unit (e.g. ad provider, weather provider, new provider, etc.), a specification of digital

content that is to be inserted into the broadcast system, wherein the digital content

pertains to data broadcasting (specification of digital video content, web data content,

EPG content, web data, etc. -figure 1, col. 4, lines 8-58; col. 5, lines 1-64);

Mao also discloses the MOREGATE broadcast server 80 interfaces with an

Internet proxy server though Ethernet to retrieve Web content and output the web

content to remultiplexer 70 as MPEG –2 transport stream (col. 5, lines 45-64).

Inherently, the unit comprises a collection unit (i.e. Internet proxy server, encoder 50,

integrated receiver/transcoder 60 – figure 1), responsive to the CP interface, to collect

the digital files of the digital content (e.g., web content) by at least one of actively

retrieving and reactively the digital files from a source (i.e., Internet) thereof identified in

the specification (identifying data to be inserted into the stream (figure 1); and

a insertion unit (remultiplexer 70, server 80), response to the CP interface, to

transfer the digital files from the collection unit to the broadcast system according to the

insertion schedule so that the digital files are multiplexed in transport stream and

broadcast to user as carousel (col. 5, lines 15-64; col. 6, lines 13-30). However, Mao

does not specifically disclose the insertion schedule is received from content provider

unit via content provider (CP) interface.

Eldering, in an analogous art, discloses the AMS comprises an advertiser interface,

e.g., Web (browser) interface that allows advertisers to enter parameters, which

characterize their advertisement and are used to form ad characterization vector (col. 5,

lines 9-14). The parameters entered by the advertisers comprises advertisement

duration, minimum advertisement bandwidth, household income, and other

advertisement specific parameters (e.g., broadcast time of the advertisement) – see col.

2, lines 30-39, col. 5, lines 30-46, col. 6, lines 18-40, col. 8, lines 35-43). The AMS uses

ad parameters to match with the avails in a programming stream, if the ad parameter(s)

match(es) with the avails data, inserting the advertisement into the programs streams

by insertion module 114 (col. 9, lines 4-12). The ad parameters entered by the

advertisers is interpreted as insertion schedule because the insertion module inserts the

advertisements as scheduled such as ad bandwidth matches with avail bandwidth, ad

time matches with avail time, ad duration matches with avail duration, etc. Thus,

Eldering discloses an insertion schedule is provided by content provider unit

(advertisers) via (CP) interface (Web browser interface) by which digital content (i.e ad

content) is to be inserted into the broadcast system. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Mao to use the teaching as taught by Eldering in order to insert the data at

predetermined time, bandwidth, duration, household size, etc. provided by the

advertiser thereby optimizing revenues in advertising, and furthermore managing the

insertion process (col. 2, lines 19-39).

Regarding claim 2, Mao in view of Eldering discloses content liaison unit as discussed

in the rejection of claim 1. Eldering further discloses the AMS includes an ability to

capture particular ads and to store those ads for later display (col. 11, lines 20-49).

Thus, the collection unit (i.e. AMS 100) includes memory into which the collection unit is

operable to store the digital files so as to decouple, in time, the collection and the

transfer of the digital files (advertisements). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify Mao and Eldering to use the teaching a further taught

by Eldering in order to store data for future use, and furthermore, to quickly provide data

upon request.

Regarding claim 3, Mao in view of Eldering discloses the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 1. Eldering further discloses the AMS receives advertisement

characterization (i.e., ad bandwidth, ad duration, etc.) and insertion schedule (e.g.,

broadcast date/time, ad duration, ad bandwidth, etc. – col. 5, line 30-col. 6, line 13; col.

10, lines 51-55) of multiple advertisements from multiple advertisers (col. 5, lines 9-39;

col. 8, lines 12-43). Thus, the claimed first content provider unit is met by one

advertiser/ad source and the second content provider unit is met by the other

advertiser/ad source, wherein the claimed CP interface, collection unit, insertion unit as

claimed are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mao and Eldering to use the

teaching as further taught by Eldering in order to optimize revenues (by auctions of the

available bandwidth to different advertisers/ad sources – col. 8, lines 15-43).

Regarding claim 4, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 3. Mao also discloses the CP interface receives data from plurality of

content providers (i.e. ad providers, news provider, weather provider, etc. – col. 4, lines

20-58). Mao further discloses data are provided to the CP interface using a common

communication protocol (e.g. DVB ASI format that carries MEPG – 2 transport stream-

figure 1, col. 5, lines 1-64). It would have been obvious that Mao in view of Eldering

discloses the first specification, first insertion schedule, second specification, and

second schedule are provided to the CP interface using a common communications

protocol in order to reduce complexity in data processing.

Regarding claim 5, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 1. Eldering further discloses the specification includes at least one of

the following:

    a characterization type of the digital content (e.g. ad bandwidth, duration, etc. –

col. 2, lines 35-49);

    a transfer schedule by which the liaison unit is to obtain the digital content (at

scheduled duration, bandwidth, time, etc. – col. 2, lines 30-49).

Regarding claim 6, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 5. Official Notice is taken that collecting times for set of content to be

received and transferred and the received time is different from the transferred time is

well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao and Eldering to use the well-

known teaching in the art so that the content can be tracked/updated and an accurate

bill can be prepared for content provider.

Regarding claim 7, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 1. Eldering further discloses the insertion schedule comprises duration

(D) of time slot (avail duration) or start time slot and end time slot for insertion

(scheduled broadcast time for advertisement to be inserted) – see col. 2, lines 31-40,

col. 5, lines 35-46, col. 6, lines 21-30.

Regarding claim 8, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 7. Eldering further discloses insertion schedule at exact time duration

of the avail (e.g., 30s - col. 6, lines 20-21), and the interface of the advertiser/ad source

receive the insertion schedule and transmit the advertisement as duration or broadcast

time as scheduled (col. 5, lines 8-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art that the insertion schedule is a microschedule (schedule for each ad); wherein

the CP interface (advertiser/ad source interface) is operable to receive a macrochedule

(avail time/duration) including at least one recurring time slot, each recurring slot having

a microschedule (schedule for each ad), respectively; and wherein the insertion unit is responsive to the macroschedule (response to avail time/duration) to insert and transfer the advertisements to maximize bandwidth utilization for the ads.

Regarding claim 9, Mao in view of Eldering discloses a liaison unit as discussed in the rejection of claim 7. Eldering further discloses when multiple ads are used with an avail, the ad with the highest correlation (and its corresponding price) is selected for placement in the avail (col. 8, lines 23-30) broadly reads on if two or more of the scheduling parameters are contradictory, then the liaison unit is operable to apply at least one conflict resolution rule to ignore at least one of the contradictory scheduling parameters in order to interpret the insertion schedule to be valid.

Regarding claim 10, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the rejection of claim 9. Eldering further discloses ad duration (e.g., 10 s; 15s; etc. – col. 5, lines 35-37) and broadcast for duration (broadcast in avail duration of the ad, i.e. 15s, 20s, etc. – col. 5, line 67-col. 6, line 1; col. 6, lines 20-21).

Regarding claim 11, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Eldering in view further discloses CP interface receives specification and the insertion schedule presented (ad parameters such as ad broadcast time, ad duration, etc.) from the content provider unit (advertisers) using a web (browser) interface (col. 5, lines 9-44). Eldering further discloses the AMS can be

realized in a software means in a number of programming languages including but not

limited to Java, C, and C++ (col. 10, lines 5-9). However, neither Mao nor Eldering

specifically discloses XML document. Official Notice is taken that using XML document

is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to use the well-known teaching in the art in order to expand capabilities of the

system.

Regarding claim 12, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 1. Mao further discloses providing an Electronic programming Guides,

Navigation pages, etc. (col. 4, lines 33-58). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in art that the specification (i.e. Electronic programming Guides or

Navigation Pages) includes at least one account (for example, account used to

customized, personalized data on the EPG, navigation page), each account including at

least one catalog (e.g. list of programs/content in the program guide/navigation page),

each catalog including at least one independent item to be output by the liaison unit to

the broadcast system or at least one group of related items to be output by the liaison

unit to the broadcast system (i.e., items in the programming guide/navigation pages

group by category, times, channel, etc.) , each group including at least one group of

related items or at least one independent item (i.e. Movies group comprises titles

related to MOVIES), so that the desired items is located easily.

Regarding claim 14, Mao in view of Eldering discloses a liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 1. Eldering further discloses a billing module is used to handle the

charges and the payments of the advertiser/ad sources (col. 9, lines 55-65). Eldering

further discloses the advertisement comprises ad duration, minimum ad bandwidth, etc.

(col. 5, lines 35-45). Necessarily, the specification and insertion schedule associated

with an account (e.g. advertiser/ad source, available bandwidth, available duration); and

the insertion unit is operable to limit the insertion schedule dictated transference of the

digital content so as to comply with a bandwidth allocation for the account (avail

bandwidth/duration for the avail ad for advertiser/ad source – col. 8, lines 2-42).

Regarding claim 15, Mao in view of Eldering teaches a liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 14. Eldering further discloses the advertisement is transmitted in avail

opportunities, such as duration, broadcast time, etc. (col. 5, line 63-col. 6, line 45).

Necessarily, the insertion unit limits the transference by processing the insertion

schedule as a plurality of incremental time slices (figure 8), the bandwidth allocation

(avail bandwidth) representing a maximum data amount of data that can be transferred

in each time slice (col. 6, lines 15-30). Eldering also disclose multiple advertisements

are used with an avail, the ad with highest correlation is selected for placement in the

avail (col. 8, lines 23-55). It would have been obvious that if transference of the

maximum amount of data takes place before the end of the time slice, then the insertion

unit is operable to suspend the transparence until a next time slice begins (next avail) in

order to maximize bandwidth utilization, and furthermore, to optimize the revenue.

Regarding claim 16, the limitations of the content provider unit as claimed correspond to

the limitation of the liaison unit as claimed in claim 1. Since the liaison unit of claim 1

connected with the content provider unit to receive information and performs functions

according to information provided by the content provider as claimed in claim 1, the

content provider must comprises features/devices corresponding to features/devices at

the liaison unit for generating information/parameters that performs the function at the

liaison unit. Therefore, rejection of limitations of claim 16 is analyzed as discussed with

respect to the rejection of claim 1, wherein an insertion schedule generator is

interpreted as the device that the advertisers uses to generates ad parameters including

ad bandwidth, ad duration, etc. (see Eldering, col. 2, lines 30-40; col. 5, lines 8-46), the

interface to a liaison unit is interpreted as Web (browser) interface (col. 5, lines 8-46),

the machine readable form is interpreted as the web page/browser, ad characterization

including ad parameters/or digital content (see Eldering 5, lines 7-46, col. 10, lines 1-

13).

Regarding claim 17, Mao in view of Eldering teaches the liaison unit as discussed in the

rejection of claim 16. Mao further discloses content provider comprises a source of the

digital content (e.g. digital TV source or Internet – figure 1).

Regarding claims 18-20, 23-26 the limitations as claimed correspond to the limitations

as claimed in claims 3-7, 11-12, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the

rejection of claims 3-8, 11-12, wherein a first machine readable form, second readable

form are read on the form/web browser/web page provided by first content

provider/advertiser, and second content provider/advertiser.

Regarding claim 22, Mao in view of Eldering discloses the content provider unit as

discussed in the rejection of claim 16. Eldering further discloses the content provider

enters ad characterizations for first advertisement and ad characterization for second

advertisement comprises bandwidth requires, duration, broadcast time, etc. (col. 5, lines

9-45; col. 8, lines 25-33). Thus, the ad characterization for first advertisement broadly

reads on the claimed first machine-readable form, first specification (e.g. duration = 15s)

and first insertion schedule (schedule bandwidth, time, duration for first advertisement)

corresponding to a first account maintained by first content provider/advertiser, which

being bounded by a first bandwidth allocation (i.e. bandwidth allocation/available for first

advertisement) and ad characterizations of the second advertisement reads on second

machine readable form, second specification of second digital content (second

advertisement) that is to be inserted into the broadcast system (col. 9, lines 5-17) and a

second insertion schedule by which the second digital content to be inserted into the

broadcast system (schedule for second ad to be inserted into the transport stream, the

second specification and insertion schedule corresponding to a second account

maintained by the content provider (second ad characterization such as broadcast time,

bandwidth, etc. correspond to a second account maintained for second advertisement,

the second account being bounded by a second bandwidth allocation different than the

first bandwidth (for example, bandwidth for second ad is 4 Mb/s and bandwidth for first

ad is 2 MB/s – col. 5, lines 30-47).

Regarding claims 35-36, the method and the computer readable medium, respectively,

direct toward embody the system of claim 1, and are analyzed as discussed with

respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claims 37-38, the method and the computer readable medium, respectively,

direct toward embody the system of claim 16, and are analyzed as discussed with

respect to the rejection of claim 16.

Regarding claim 44, Mao discloses a broadcast system for use with a broadcast system

operable to carry digital packets to multiple recipients simultaneously (set top box 150).

The data broadcast system (figure 1) comprising:

a content provider unit (advertising provider, web provider, news provider, digital TV

provider, etc.) to generate a specification of digital content (programming guide,

navigation page, information for advertisements, etc.) by which the digital content is to

be inserted into a broadcast signal (using server 80 and remultiplexer 70) at the network

10, wherein the digital pertains to data broadcasting (figure 1, col. 4, line 10-col. 5, line

67);

a content liaison (network 10) to communicate with the content provider

unit over a communication network (e.g. network 110, 30,40-figure 1), to receive the

specification of digital content from the content provider unit over the communication

network, and to insert the digital content into the broadcast signal according to the

insertion schedule (col. 4, line 10-col. 5, line 67). However, Mao does not specifically

disclose the insertion schedule is provided from content provider.

Eldering, in an analogous art, discloses the AMS comprises an advertiser interface,

e.g., Web (browser) interface that allows advertisers to enter parameters, which

characterize their advertisement and are used to form ad characterization vector (col. 5,

lines 9-14). The parameters entered by the advertisers comprises advertisement

duration, minimum advertisement bandwidth, household income, and other

advertisement specific parameters (e.g., broadcast time of the advertisement) – see col.

2, lines 30-39, col. 5, lines 30-46, col. 6, lines 18-40, col. 8, lines 35-43). The AMS uses

ad parameters to match with the avails in a programming stream, if the ad parameter(s)

match(es) with the avails data, inserting the advertisement into the programs streams

by insertion module 114 (col. 9, lines 4-12). The ad parameters entered by the

advertisers is interpreted as insertion schedule because the insertion module inserts the

advertisements as scheduled such as ad bandwidth matches with avail bandwidth, ad

time matches with avail time, ad duration matches with avail duration, etc. Thus,

Eldering discloses an insertion schedule is provided by content provider unit

(advertisers) by which digital content (i.e ad content) is to be inserted into the broadcast

system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Mao to use the teaching as taught by Eldering in

order to insert the data at predetermined time, bandwidth, duration, household size, etc.

provided by the advertiser thereby optimizing revenues in advertising, and furthermore

managing the insertion process (col. 2, lines 19-39).

Regarding claim 45, Mao further discloses the broadcast signal into which the digital

content is inserted contains therein video and/or video program content (audio and/or

video content received via encoder 50 and/or transcoder 60 – figure 1).

Regarding claim 46, Mao in view of Eldering discloses a system as discussed in the

rejection of claim 44, Eldering further discloses the avail sales/auctioning module also

calculates the placement of the advertisements based on the degree of correlation and

a pricing scheme...(col. 7, line 64-col. 9, line 65) reads on the content provider unit

(advertiser) and the content liaison unit (AMS) negotiate with each other over the

communication network to allocate a bandwidth for the digital content (advertisement

content) specified by the content provider unit. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao to use

the teaching as further taught by Eldering so that the highest price for the advertisement

is received by the AMS (col. 8, lines 23-33; col. 9, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 47, Mao further discloses the set top box (150) receives and extract

the data from the received broadcast signal (figures 1-5) reads on at least one receiver

device to receive the broadcast signal including the digital content and to extract data

from the received broadcast signal.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Fries (US 6,317,885) discloses interactive entertainment and information system usign

television set top box.

Mao et al. (US 6,886,178) discloses digital TV system with synchronized world wide

web content.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son P. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-7295. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SPH
March 15 2006

HAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER